Comment on: Nonlocal "Realistic" Leggett Models Can be Considered Refuted by the Before-Before Experiment

Marek Żukowski¹

¹Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, ul. Wita Stwosza 57, PL-08-952 Gdańsk, Poland (Dated: August 30, 2008)

It is shown here that Suarez [Found. Phys. **38**, 583 (2008)] wrongly presents the assumptions behind the Leggett's inequalities, and their modified form used by Groeblacher et al.[Nature **446**, 871 (2007)] for an experimental falsification of a certain class of non-local hidden variable models.

This comment is not aimed at a detailed discussion of the arguments given by Suarez in [1]. The sole aim is to clearly state that he misrepresents the assumptions behind the experiment described in [2], and thus the whole set of issues associated with the Leggett's inequalities [3]. Thus the starting point of the paper is incorrect. Therefore, the conclusions of the paper have no direct logical relation with the theory and the experimental results presented in [2].

Suarez writes

"Groeblacher et al. choose an explicit nonlocal dependence of Bob's outcomes on Alice's ones, though, they note, that one can also choose any other example of a possible non-local dependence. Thus, the local polarization measurement outcomes A are predetermined by the polarization vectors u and an additional set of hidden variables λ specific to the source. The local polarization measurement outcomes B are predetermined by the polarization vectors u and v, the set of hidden variables λ, the settings a and b, and any possible non-local dependence of Bob's outcomes on Alice's ones. It is a crucial trait" [1].

Let us compare the above with what is actually assumed in [2].

• "Let us consider a specific source, which emits pairs of photons with well-defined polarizations ${\bf u}$ and ${\bf v}$ to laboratories of Alice and Bob, respectively. The local polarization measurement outcomes ${\bf A}$ and ${\bf B}$ are fully determined by the polarization vector, by an additional set of hidden variables λ specific to the source and by any set of parameters η outside the source. For reasons of clarity, we choose an explicit non-local dependence of the outcomes on the settings ${\bf a}$ and ${\bf b}$ of the measurement devices."

That is, no gender asymmetry is assumed: Groeblacher et al. choose an explicit nonlocal dependence of Bob's outcomes on Alice's local parameters and Alice's outcomes on Bob's local parameters. This is the starting

point for the derivation of the inequalities, and therefore the experiment of Groeblacher et al. pertains to this case.

Finally one should also explain that *only* in the Appendix I of the *supplementary information* for the paper (easily accessible in [4]) one finds a construction of *an explicit toy* non-local model, which satisfies the assumptions of the form given by Suarez. But

- Models satisfying these assumptions are a proper sub-class of Leggett-type models.
- This is just a *toy* model, the sole role of which is to show that the class of non-local hidden variable models introduced by Leggett contains one that "perfectly simulates all quantum mechanical predictions for measurements in a plane of the Poincaré sphere" [4], and therefore maximally violates the CHSH inequalities. It *plays no other role* whatsoever in any other reasoning contained in the paper.
- The model can be trivially gender symmetrized.

The work is a part of QAP (Qubit Applications), 6th EU Framework Programme. It has been done at the *National Centre for Quantum Information of Gdansk*. The co-authors of reference [2] are thanked for discussions.

^[1] A. Souarez, Found. Phys. 38, 583 (2008)

^[2] S. Gröblacher, T. Paterek, R. Kaltenbaek, Č. Brukner, M. Żukowski, M. Aspelmeyer, and A. Zeilinger, Nature 446, 871 (2007).

^[3] A. J. Leggett, Found. Phys. **33**, 1469 (2003).

^[4] S. Gröblacher, T. Paterek, R. Kaltenbaek, Č. Brukner, M. Żukowski, M. Aspelmeyer, and A. Zeilinger, e-print arxiv.org 0704.2529v2